DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 253 SP 031 166

AUTHOR Lindle, Jane C.
TITLE Issues in Instructional Supervision: The Lead Teacher vs. the Supervisor.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; *Instructional Leadership; Interpersonal Relationship; *Master Teachers; Mentors; *Supervisor Qualifications; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

Excellence in teaching, the reform reports tell us, depends at least partially on "professionalizing" teaching. The "new" positions of master or lead teacher are proposed as a method of improving the status of our best teachers and placing them in positions to mentor other teachers. Are these new positions any different than the "old" positions of supervisors, "head" teachers, or principals? In addition, don't these same reports demand a return to or more "instructional leadership" from these old actors in education? Can both recommendations be served? This paper examines the history of instructional support personnel and their future roles given the clamor over the need for changing the role of teachers and for improving instructional leadership. Beyond the review of the literature, areas of research are delineated for identifying what has worked and is salvageable from the relationships and conceptualizations of the profession of teaching and the support of instruction. Sixty-five references are cited in the bibliography. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307253

Issues in Instructional Supervision: The Lead Teacher vs. the Supervisor

by
Jane C. Lindle, Ph.D.
Administrative & Policy Studies
University of Pittsburgh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. C. Lindle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Fransico, March, 1989.

SP031166

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Issues in Instructional Supervision: The Lead Teacher vs. the Supervisor

by
Jane C. Lindle, Ph.D.
Administrative & Policy Studies
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

The 1980's will be remembered at least as the decade of reform reports, if not actual reform. Beginning with the effectiveness literature of the late 1970's, and entering the national political arena in 1983, reform reports have inundated educators with a "symptomology" of exemplary schools, directives for "effective" teaching practices, and heaps of criticism for many educational activities, including some of the behaviors praised in the "effectiveness" literature. The penalty for paying strict attention to all the recommendations, mandates, and directives may be accidental implementation of reforms which destroy rather than improve the professional and organizational relationships which support teaching and instruction.

Excellence in teaching, the reform reports tell us, depends at least partially on "professionalizing" teaching. The "new" positions of master or lead teacher are proposed as a method of improving the status of our best teachers and placing them in positions to mentor other teachers. Are these new positions any different than the "old" positions of supervisors, "head" teachers, or principals? In addition, don't these same reports demand a return to or more "instructional leadership" from these old actors in education? Can both recommendations be served? This paper examines the history of instructional support personnel and their future roles given the clamor over the need for changing the role of teachers and for improving instructional leadership. Beyond the review of the literature, areas of research are delineated for identifying what has worked and is salvageable from the relationships and conceptualizations of the profession of teaching and the support of instruction.

Issues in Instructional Supervision: The Lead Teacher vs. the Supervisor

by

Jane C. Lindle
Administrative & Policy Studies
University of Pittsburgh

Defining the Issue: Reform without Memory?

The 1980's will be remembered at least as the decade of reform reports, if not actual reform. Beginning with the effectiveness literature of the late 1970's (Edmonds 1979; Brookover & Lezotte 1979), and entering the national political arena in 1983 (Gardner 1983; Beyer 1983), reform reports have inundated educators with a "symptomology" of exemplary schools, directives for "effective" teaching practices, and heaps of criticism for many educational activities, including some of the behaviors praised in the "effectiveness" literature (Purkey & Smith 1985). The second round of reports, led by the Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, are aimed at the teaching career itself. Accepting all of these reports at face value may exact some unintended penalties. The strictest penalty, for paying close attention to all the recommendations, mandates, and directives, may be accidental implementation of reforms which destroy rather than improve the professional and organizational relationships which support teaching and instruction.

Objectives

This paper focuses on the reports concerning the improvement of the teaching profession, especially the Carnegie Report. Both the

Carnegie and Holmes Reports announced that teaching has all the features of a job, but must be professionalized to become a true career. Other reports on the status of the field of teaching echo these two reports. Each mandates graduate studies for the professionalizing process. The Carnegie Report, in particular, promotes a career ladder designed to escalate the status of the teacher as she moves on a continuum of responsibilities from teaching children to educating and coaching her peers.

The move into the coaching status brings the teacher a "new" title. The "new" positions of master or lead teachers are proposed as a method of improving the status of our best teachers and placing them in positions to mentor other teachers. This paper attempts to raise and postulate answers to several questions. Are these new positions any different than the "old" positions of supervisors, "head" teachers, or principals? In addition, don't these reports clash with earlier reports which demand a return to more "instructional leadership" from these old actors in education? Can both recommendations be served?

This paper examines the history of instructional support personnel and their future roles given the clamor over the need for changing the role of teachers and for improving instructional leadership. Concluding the review of the historical literature, areas of research are delineated for identifying what has worked and is salvageable from the relationships and conceptualizations of the profession of teaching and the support of instruction.

Perspectives & Conceptual Framework

> What experience and history teach is this --- that people and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it (Hegel 1832).

A Rationale for Historical Analysis

Reform efforts in American education are not new. Yet the deluge of reform recommendations for this decade is greater than anything since the post-Sputnik era. The importance of carefully analyzing and properly implementing these reports requires a thorough understanding of the politics, organizational character, and history of schooling in America (Boyd 1987; Tanner 1983). To fail to learn from the archives of American educational reform condemns the promise of the present excellence and reform movements to repetition of the incremental change and ambiguous practices of a mediocre past (Boyd 1987; Kliebard 1986). Already, there is some embarrassing evidence that some of the recommendations promoted by the current wave of reform reports merely repeat, without acknowledgment or awareness of efficacy, ancient positions on what instruction ought and ought not be (Blumberg 1985).

In the current morass of reform literature, two themes which ought to be of considerable concern to instructional supervision emerge; "professionalizing teaching," and "instructional leadership." Little synthesis of these themes has been attempted. In fact, the tendency has been to treat these issues individually, a fallacy which hampers the potential for implementing either ideal (Lieberman 1988).

The analysis of the integral relationships of "professionalization of teaching" and "instructional leadership" requires definition of the terminology related to these issues from both the past and the present perspectives. The etymology of these phrases is fascinating.

The History of Professionalizing Teaching

It is significant that the Carnegie Report speaks strongly to the issue of professionalization of teaching. The strengths and weaknesses of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching are worth noting here because the 1986 Carnegie Forum Report is the result of a "program of the Carnegie Corporation of New York" (Carnegie Report, p.ii.) The Carnegie Corporation, which was founded in 1911 six years after the establishment of the Carnegie Foundations for the Advancement of Teaching, is a grant-making foundation. Its relationship to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has been complex (Lagemann, p.52-53). The 1986 Report includes among its Task Force members, John W. Gardner, former president of both the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching "for 10 years" (Carnegie Report, p.130.) The Carnegie Report acknowledged the importance of bringing together people with a variety of perspectives on educational issues (Carnegie Report,p.6), yet the connections between the history of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's Flexner Report and the aspirations of the current report are directly cited by the current Carnegie Report on the very next page (Carnegie Report, p.7). That the Carnegie Report, itself, challenges the Flexner Report for its spot in history, requires

a healthy awareness of the contents, history and politics of both reports.

Lagemann's (1983) recent history of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching vividly illustrates one of Andrew Carnegie's missions to improve the status of teachers. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was originally funded to provide pensions for college and university faculty; however, the first president of the Carnegie Foundation, Henry Smith Pritchett, was primarily interested in promoting American universities as organized centers of knowledge in society (Lagemann 1983, p.21.)

Pritchett was responsible for authorizing Foundation support for the Flexner Report on Medical Education in 1910. The Flexner Report also was supported by the American Medical Association (AMA) and practicing doctors. This report was instrumental in establishing the modern medical school linked with both universities and hospitals.

Abraham Flexner was a former "schoolmaster" from Lexington, Kentucky, who had just completed study in Germany. He was the brother of a doctor, but not a physician himself. Pritchett hired Flexner to complete the study of medical training as an educator, an arbitrator on matters of training regardless of the profession under review.

The Flexner Report appeared at a time when reform of the medical profession was well underway. The Report both spurred and documented the changes. The Flexner Report recommended standards linking medical schools with libraries and universities, as well as hospitals, and limiting access of aspirants to the field. It succeeded in both improving services and limiting access to the services. The

preparation recommended by this report included early preparation in the sciences, laboratory instruction and finally, hospital-based clinical practice (Lagemann, p.74).

Pritchett felt the Flexner Report was important for positioning the influence of the Carnegie Foundation since the medical profession was ready for reform. The Carnegie Foundation could be used as a source for other professions to strengthen their standards through a comprehensive review of the requirements for preservice preparation. This advantageous moment was fleeting. The Foundation's subsequent report on the legal profession did not enjoy as much success (Lagemann, p.82.)

The complete lack of attention drawn by the Foundation's first report on teaching, The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools (1920) was disappointing. This report, referred to as the Missouri Study, took a totally different approach to the education of teachers, than the one the Foundation had promoted for the education of doctors and lawyers. In this report, teacher preparation was recommended as vocational training, that is, classroom specific techniques to be taught to pre-practicing teachers. This would take place devoid of the arts and sciences which had been recommended as appropriate for aspiring doctors and lawyers (Lagemann, p.88.)

According to the Lagemann history, most of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's influence was indirect. Professionalism of education is and was the goal, but the ability to promote the profession itself was hampered by the extremely

decentralized nature of the work, the lack of a unifying professional organization and a characteristic diffusion of the structure of the work of teaching for different ages, and subjects.

The Flexner Report of 1910 and the Carnegie Report of 1986: a Comparison

The current Carnegie Report aspires to be as influential as the Flexner Report. Some significant similarities and differences in each situation and in the content of each report must be noted.

The temper of the times is similar. Reform of educational practice, as well as preparation in the profession is as much a focus currently as reform of the medical profession was in the early part of this century. The research-base of education, evidenced by publication of several handbooks of research in the latter part of this century (e.g., Gage 1963, Thorndike 1971, Wittrock 1986, and Boyan 1988), has become more well-formed, much as was true of medicine as a science at the turn of the century.

The differences between situations of the professions are obstacles to reform of education at the same level of success as Flexner's Report enjoyed. There is no single lobby for reform in teacher education as there was in medical education as embodied by the AMA's Council on Medical Education (Lagemann, p.64.) At the early part of the twentieth century, there was one association, the AMA, to which 50% of the physicians in the country belonged (Lagemann, p.65.) Currently, professional educators do not belong to any single

organization which could claim such a high percentage of the country's educational professionals.

Today, elementary and secondary teachers belong to the National Educational Association (NEA), a group which was formed by school administrators and college professors in the early part of this century (Black & English 1986). Classroom teachers were not represented as a group in this organization until the middle of the century. During the 1960's and '70's, intense rivalries over collective bargaining and union representation erupted in schools. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) which had its birth in Chicago in 1903, became a worthy competitor of the NEA. In the early portion of this decade, over 75% of teachers belonged to a union, the majority belonging to the NEA (Ravitch 1983). At the same time, school administrators and others who had been instrumental in founding the NEA were voted out of the organization. Unionism, of course, is incompatible with administration.

School administrators belong to the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) which currently boasts 17,000 members (AASA 1989.) The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) represents instructional support personnel including administrators, supervisors, and curriculum coordinators, and classroom teachers. The aforementioned organizations serve a membership composed primarily of educators practicing in kindergarten through 12th grades. There are other organizations which serve teachers in particular subject areas, such as the International Reading Association, Council for Exceptional Children, the National Council of Teachers of

Mathematics, etc.

College professors are generally represented by another amorphous set of professional organizations. College professors in schools of education generally belong to the American Educational Research Association (AERA) whose annual meeting often attracts over 5,000 people (Wildman, Fletcher & Prentiss 1989, 17). The American Association of Teacher Educators represents another group of university level professionals. The Holmes Group, formed in 1983 from a group of 17 education deans, consists of invited institutional membership. Similar organizations exist for particular departments or specialties in education. Within each specialty, other professional organizations abound.

The considerable variety of the organizations to which a teacher might belong illustrates the stratification of the field. Organizations can be listed in education, according to specialty, and/or grouped by membership, according to whether the members are primarily classroom teachers or university or college professors or school administrators. The diversity of the organizations illustrate a major difference between the field of education in the latter part of the twentieth century and the field of medicine in the early part of the same century.

The final difference in the two reports pertains to the content of each. The Flexner Report specifies the strengths and weaknesses of specific schools of medicine. It represents data collected on site concerning the facilities and qualifications of both the professors and the students. It was designed to indict and close schools which did

not meet the standards of the profession as defined by the emerging AMA lobby. Implementation was developed locally (Lagemann, p.72-73).

The Carnegie Report relies on data collected through the commission of 12 papers by the Task Force and through "expert" participation in two workshops sponsored by the Task Force. The Report covers far more than the educational preparation of the profession, turning to school districts to provide the career differentiation a profession requires. No specific states or institutions are held up as exemplary nor are any indicted. The Report calls for implementation through "invitation" to national organizations of teachers, state policy leaders, higher education, and local communities (Carnegie Report 1986).

The possible success of the current Carnegie Report appears to center on one difference between today and the Missouri Study of 1920. In contrast to 1920, reform of education, today, is an intensely popular topic. Yet the lack of consensus in the profession today on any topic, the lack of representativeness of the profession as a whole in any professional organization, and the scattered recommendations of the Report itself make the success of "professionalizing" education a gamble.

The History of Instructional Leadership

The history of "instructional leadership" is as one of the reform labels of this decade. Instructional leadership is founded on the effective schools literature. As a recent term, the meaning does not have universal application (Liebermann & Miller, p.61). For the

purposes of this paper, instructional leadership refers to activities of any professional designed to influence instructional performance of teachers. This definition was chosen to reflect the intent of the effective schools literature which was designed to provide a basis for improving schools (Purkey & Smith 1985). In addition, this definition demonstrates the ambivalence of the literature as to who provides this leadership, the current principals and supervisors of instruction, or the future master teachers or lead teachers called for in some of the reform literature.

Instructional Leadership by Current Principals & Supervisors

Instructional leadership which is focussed on improving teacher performance forces an investigation of the personnel who are to perform these activities. Experience with schools and the literature tell us that school supervision was designed for these purposes.

Unfortunately, supervision lacks a historical perspective which is lamented by many of its scholars (e.g. Burton 1926, 7; Lucio & McNeil 1969, 19-20; Eye, Netzer & Krey 1971, 22-23; Marks, Stoops & King-Stoops 1985, 8-11; Smyth 1987; Oliva 1989,4). Many texts on supervision launch directly into the author's perspectives on the subject with minimal or no acknowledgment of the status of the field, past or present (e.g. Gist 1926, Goldhammer 1969, Acheson & Gall 1987.)

The first attempts to record the histories of school supervisors appeared in the 1930's in works by Burton (1926) and Barr, Burton & Brueckner (1938). In the late 1960's, further attempts to clarify the fugitive past of the field were developed. The work of a few authors

in the late '60's were also given to organizing the history by a philosophical orientation as well as a chronology (e.g. Eye & Netzer 1965, Lucio & McNeil 1969, Marks & Stoops 1971.)

Of the few histories extant on supervision, most pay credit to colonial communities for developing the rudiments of supervision. The earliest conception of supervision was found in colonial committees of citizens (clergy and other leading townsmen) who visited schools to inspect facilities and equipment. Students' achievement was also subject to examination (Barr, Burton, & Brueckner 1938, p.3). Later, inspection of classroom techniques were added. The writers of the early part of this century refer to the recent addition of supervision to the duties of the principal, head teacher or superintendent (Burton 1926, Barr et al 1938). The initial duties of these individuals appear to have been primarily tasks of management of student discipline and facilities as both local school boards, and then later superintendents, seemed reluctant to relinquish their power to supervise instruction (Marks, Stoops & King-Stoops 1985).

The historical literature of instructional supervision, while admittedly sparse, is undeniably repetitive. Even, or perhaps especially, authors who do not attempt an historical review in their scholarship on supervision emphasize the need to change the emphasis in educational management from a focus on budgets and buildings to one on classroom practices. The current calls for "instructional leadership" are mere echoes of this literature.

Instructional Leadership as Part of Professionalizing Teaching

"Master Teacher" as a reform label, in this decade, has a longer history than "Lead Teacher," a term which has received legitimacy from its use by the Carnegie Report (1986). Neither term is really new since both once were predecessors for the terms "supervisor" and "superintendent." The principal was once known as the "Principal Teacher" (Black & English 1986, 95). The root of all these terms is the notion of "Teacher of Teachers" (Bolin 1987).

Staff development is the language we use now to describe the "Teaching of Teachers" that is supposed to improve the quality of instruction. Even in 1845, Blumberg (1985) tells us that supervisors were optimistic, effusive and dedicated to improving instruction through holding teacher institutes. At that time, the need for such a training experience was necessary because of the rather lax professional preparation which existed for teachers before they became the sole leader of a classroom (Bolin 1987, p. 370; Kirst 1984; p.28). The other way of handling the probable difficulties with the virtually uneducated teachers of the early 1800's was to focus on textbooks and curriculum (Kliebard 1986, p.2.)

Perceptions of the preservice educational situation apparently have not changed. Many of the current reports conclude that teachers really learn teaching from the experience, not from their preservice preparation (Lieberman & Miller 1984, p.24; Griffin 1986, p.8). Two remedies are recommended in the current literature: (1) extend the professional preparation period and (2) establish a differentiated

recognition of the stages of development of a career teacher (Holmes Group 1986; Carnegie Report 1986).

The reform reports suggest that colleges and universities and the "new" teacher of teachers, the master or lead teacher, hold joint responsibility for the extension of professional preparation. Implementing this supposed change, may not produce anything new or different in either professional development or the professional roles of people in the school. Actually, there is a latent danger in accepting the reform recommendations at face value. Several undesirable ramifications are possible, including replication of the current bureaucracy and dysfunction in the relationships between teachers and supervisors (Lieberman 1988, Blumberg 1980).

The Carnegie Report appears to assume that good teachers find their reward not only through respectable salaries, but also through status achieved among their peers. The assumption continues that achieving status means that these teachers must be removed from classrooms to coach and supervise their colleagues, to serve as consultants on the curriculum and other duties as particular schools see fit to designate (Carnegie Report 1986, p.59-60). This assumption selects as perks, activities which have been delegated and redelegated from school boards to superintendents to principals to supervisors. The big question is not addressed by the Carnegie Report, that is, would "good teachers" see these tasks as attractive?

For many teachers, these activities would not be perks. Ray Raphael (1985) describes the notion of a career ladder as "anachronistic" in education (p.127). Teaching is a service, and if

you choose to teach because you desire working with children, you will not go into administration. Administrators work with adults, not children. Administrators work with politics and power and are less autonomous than teachers (Black & English, p.18). Teachers know these things and make deliberate decisions not to assume administrative roles (Lortie 1975, p.85).

Lortie, however, does explain that career ladders do serve useful purposes in professions and the lack of career staging does have a negative impact on teaching (p.86). Lortie's work is particularly explicit about several inhibiting professional features of teaching including the institutionalization of high turn-over in the profession, the relatively easy entry, the relatively long period of required education, and the incredibly short apprenticeship (Chapter 3).

The Carnegie Report suggests that a Masters in Teaching degree be used to up-grade the profession. This would increase the required years of education as well as the required clinical period (p.75-77); however, the Report is very careful not to recommend that licensure be dependent on such preparation. These suggestions are made separately from the Report's discussion of the role of Lead Teachers, but consideration of the suggested career ladder cannot be made without reviewing suggestions concerning teacher preparation.

The contrast between Lortie's work on teaching as a profession and the Report's perspectives on improving the profession might be called minimal, but while Lortie expresses hope for an increased apprenticeship with more elaborate supports for beginning teachers (p.231-232), he does not propose any particular differentiated career

ladder merely hoping that something can be worked out to the agreement of both teacher organizations and school administrators (p.233). The Carnegie Report attempts to dispel any possible conflicts between administrators and teachers career ladders by cautioning that lead teachers should not assume administrative roles, such as assistant principal (p.58); however, the tasks described are sufficiently managerial in nature as to give teachers who want to work with children a definite incentive not to become a lead teacher, any more than they would desire to be a principal.

Educational Importance of This Study

Historical and field research evidence would suggest that neither providing instructional leadership nor professionalizing teaching through the use of career ladders is as simple a task as the Carnegie Report suggests. Raphael's rejection of the professional climbing of teachers as anachronistic, and Lortie's ambivalence over the description of a career ladder illustrate the central issue of this paper. The Carnegie Report is part of a number of answers for reform in education. But these answers have not dealt adequately with the identification of the questions which must form the basis for discussion of educational reform.

These questions are complex and closely related. Who are the instructional leaders of a school? What happens when you formalize instructional leadership? What happens when you attempt to develop

career stages for teaching which focus on leadership roles as opposed to the work of teaching?

Supervision lacks a considerable knowledge base because the purpose of supervisors in schools is poorly articulated and because awareness of the history of supervision of instruction is poor as well (Smyth 1987, p.567). Compounding this gap of knowledge by generating more roles for teachers and "instructional leaders" will not produce the desired improvement for the profession of teaching nor for the achievement of excellence or effectiveness in instruction. Replacing one ambiguity with another is not viable reform, but semantic manipulation.

Charting the Future, Knowing the Past

Although the historical relation between the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is long and complex, the 1986 Carnegie Report must fall short of its own aspirations to be the "Flexner Report" for teaching simply because the Carnegie institutions ignored their own history with the Flexner Report. The basis of the 1986 Report depends on the expertise of its 14 member Task Force, the 12 papers it commissioned and the two workshops its held. Unlike the Flexner Report, no comprehensive review nor direct data collection from the field was undertaken by the Task Force. In addition, recommendations for teaching as a profession were made without historical reference to existing educational career ladders, nor with any reference to current field research work on the perspectives of teachers regarding their profession. The twelve papers

were essentially demographic in nature dealing with issues related to the teacher pool and financial support. The two workshops focused on finance and school administration. [It is interesting to note that only one person who was not a school administrator is listed in the Report as attending the workshop on school administration.]

The Carnegie Report has added to the rhetoric of reform for this decade. Its lack of substantive data has prolonged the debate about educators' roles in instructional leadership. The issues raised by the Report affirm the need to reform teaching as a profession, but unlike the Flexner Report, it lacks the political base necessary to substantially change education in local schools or teachers in their individual classrooms.

The Report could, and has, challenged experimentation by colleges of education and some state licensing agencies. Perhaps the results of this experimentation, if well documented, if successfully reported, will become the Flexner Report of the 1990's that can reform education, the practice and the profession.

Conclusion

An appreciation of well-tested organizational structures and conceptualizations of the supports for instruction in a school can lead to school improvement. Rather than frenzied legislation of school reform efforts for the "professionalization of teaching" or the myopic press for "instructional leadership," a push for examination of what has worked in supervision of instruction is developing in the current literature concerning supervision of instruction and staff development

(Bolin 1987; Griffin 1985; Garman, Glickman, Hunter & Haggerson 1987; Joyce & Showers 1988, p.7; Kasten 1986, p.282; Reinhartz & Beach 1987, p. 363; Suhor 1987, p.63). Specifically, a definition of supervision and an empirical identification of the relationships of the supervisor and teacher in the context of particular schools which most enhance instruction are required to provide meaning to the work of both supervisors and teachers.

The push for reform in education will only make inroads if the field acknowledges its own history. Historical perspectives can provide reformers with better avenues for exploration and research. Carefully constructed reports on the field which synthesize its history as well as current trends and developments are the better argument for reform. The Flexner Report provided the field of medicine both documentation of its reform efforts as well as data on where to proceed with those efforts. Education, despite the plethora of reform documents in the 1980's, is still sadly in need of a Flexner Report.

Bibliography

Acheson, K.A. & Gall, M.D. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

American Association of School Administrators. (1989). Information Packet. Arlington, VA: AASA.

Barr,A.S., Burton, W. H. & Brueckner, L.J. (1938). Supervision: Principles and Practices. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.

Berliner, D.C. (1980). Using research on teaching for the improvement of classroom practice. Theory Into Practice, 19(4), 302-308.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1976). Implementation of educational innovation. Educational Forum, 40, 345-372.

Beyer, L.E. (1985). Educational reform: The political roots of national risk. Curriculum Inquiry, 15(1), 37-56.

Black, J.A. & English, F.W. (1986). What They Don't Tell You in Schools of Education About School Administration. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co.

Blase, J.J. (1987). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. American Educational Research Journal, 24(4), 589-610.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon Publishing Corp.

----- (1985). Where we came from: Notes on supervision in the 1840's. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1(1), 56-65.

Bolin, F.S. (1987). On defining supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(4), 368-380.

Boyan, N.J., ed. (1988). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

Boyd, W.L. (1987). Public education's last hurrah?: Schizophrenia, amnesia, and ignorance in school politics. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), 85-100.

Brandt, R. (1986). On the expert teacher: A conversation with David Berliner. Educational Leadership, 44(2), 4-9.

----- (1987). On leadership and student achievement: A conversation with Richard Andrews. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 9-16.

Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L.W. (1979). Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Burton, W.H. (1926). Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Caldwell, S.D. (1985) The master teacher as staff developer. Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 55-60.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation.

DiBernardo, G. & Stiles, D. (1988). The Madeline Hunter and Lee Canter teacher improvement packages: What every school needs? Democratic Schools, 3(2), 1-9.

Doyle, W. (1985). Effective teaching and the concept of master teacher. Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 27-33.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(1), 15-24.

Eye, G.G., Netzer, L.A. & Krey, R.D. (1971) Supervision of Instruction 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Firestone, W.A. & Wilson, B.L. (1985) Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(2), 7-30.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Gage, N.L. (ed.). (1963). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gardner, D.P. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Garman, N. (1986). Clinical supervision: Quackery or remedy for professional development. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1(2), 148-157.

Garman, N.B., Glickman, C.D., Hunter, M., & Haggerson, N.L. (1987). Conflicting conceptions of clinical supervision and the enhancement of professional growth and renewal: Point and counterpoint. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(2), 152-177.

Gist, A.S. (1926). Elementary School Supervision. New York: Scribner & Sons.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Greene, M. (1985). A philosophic look at merit and mastery in teaching. Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 17-26.

Griffin, G.A. (1985). The school as a workplace and the master teacher concept. Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 1-16.

Hoffman, J.V. & Edwards, S.A. (eds.). (1986). Reality and Reform in Clinical Teacher Education. New York: Random House.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Jackson, S.A., Logsdon, D.M. & Taylor, N.E. (1983). Instructional leadership behaviors: Differentiating effective from ineffective low-income urban schools. Urban Education, 18(1), 59-70.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1988). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longman.

Kasten, K. (1986). Redesigning teachers' work. Issues in Education, 4(3), 272-286.

Kirst, M.W. (1984). Who Controls Our Schools? New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Kliebard, H.M. (1986). The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Klein, M.F. (1985). The master teacher as curriculum leader. Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 35-43.

Lagemann, E.C. (1983). Private Power for the Public Good. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 648-653.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, Their World, and Their Work. Alexandria VA: ASCD.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lucio, W.H. & McNeil, J.D. (1969). Supervision: A synthesis of Thought and Action 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988.) A blueprint for empowering teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(7), 472-477.

Marks, J.R., Stoops, E. & King-Stoops, J. (1985). Handbook of Educational Supervision 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

McLaughlin, M.W. (1984). Teachers evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 193-207.

McNeely, R.L. (1984). Master teachers as master workers. Social Policy, 14 (3), 57-60.

Meier, D. (1985). Retaining the teacher's perspective in the principalship. Education and Urban Society, 17(3), 302-310.

Oliva, P.F. (1989). Supervision for Today's Schools 3rd ed. New York: Longman.

Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 352-389.

Rallis, S. F. & Highsmith, M.C. (1986). The myth of the 'great' principal: Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 300-304.

Raphael, R. (1985). The Teacher's Voice: A Sense of Who We Are. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Reinhartz, J. & Beach, D. (1987). A comprehensive supervision model for promoting professional development. Clearinghouse, 60(8), 363-366.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1987). Education reform strategies: Will they increase teacher commitment? American Journal of Education, 95(4), 534-562.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. (1983). Supervision: Human Perspectives 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smyth, W.J. (1987). Cinderella syndrome: A philosophical view of supervision as a field of study. Teachers College Record, 88(4), 567-588.

Suhor, C. (1987). The instructional supervisor: Four deployment models. English Education, 19(1), 58-64.

Thorndike, R.L. (ed.). (1971). Educational Measurement 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Wildman, T.M., Fletcher, H.J. & Prentiss, K. (1989). Changes in institutional participation at AERA annual meetings. Educational Researcher, 17(9), 17-18.

Wittrock, M.C. (ed.). (1986). Handbook of Research on Teaching 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.

Zumwalt, K. (ed.). (1986). Improving Teaching. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.